20/24

File No. 202
1928.

Collection No. (1)

A/6

Pros. Serial Nos. 1-8-14-1 P-37

14/6

Subject.

Special pay for Registrars & Ct Court

Previous References.	Later References.
F 16 B 44/28	New F. 750/31

MGIPC—FP—725DCF—S&P—(G-1576)—14-3-28—60,000.

No. 4-11-200, dt 25.5.28, from the Audit Officer, Bangalore
No. PB 787, dt 1.6.28, from the Pay & Accounts Officer, Bangalore
No. 1763 dt 7.6.28, from the Dt. Judge Coorg

27

S.N. 48 (J)

In Resident's Proceedings No.390, dated the 16th January, 1928, a special pay of Rs.75/- per mensem was sanctioned for the Registrar of the District Court of the Civil and Military Station and in Proceedings No. 2904, dated the 21st March, 1928, it was directed that the sanction would take effect from 1st November, 1926, the extra expenditure being met by reappropriation or otherwise in the course of 1928-29.

S.N. 57 (L)

28

S.N. 58 (P)

The Audit Officer asked to be informed of the special circumstances in which retrospective effect was given to the sanction. The reply given to him will be found at ≠S.N.59

≠(S)

29

P.U.C. I and II

These may be dealt with together.

In the first place, it is submitted that the suggestion in paragraph 2 of P.U.C.I that the necessity for the continuance of the special pay may be reviewed once a year appears reasonable and may perhaps be agreed to

ajes 9/6

30

The main point for consideration is that raised in paragraph 1 of P.U.C., namely, the question of getting the approval of the Government of India to the retrospective effect.

para. 3 of S.N. 47 (H)
para. 4 of S.N. 51 (K)

The Pay and Accounts Officer through whom the proposals were forwarded by the District Judge did not advise that the approval of the Government of India was necessary, nor did the Audit Officer himself raise the point in ≠his previous letter, dated 4-4-1928.

≠S.N. 58, P

It will

3

(G)

It will be seen from P.U.C.II that the Pay and Accounts Officer is still of opinion that Rule 2(b) of the Book of Financial Powers does not apply to the case nor does he take it that the standing rule referred to in the enclosure to P.U.C.I admits of no exception. On the whole the view of the Audit Officer appears to be incorrect for the following reasons:-

(D)

(i) Paragraph 12 of the Government of India Resolution, dated the 15th January, 1924, does not say that the giving of retrospective effect requires their sanction. It says that "all authorities who are competent to sanction revision of pay should bear in mind that retrospective effect should not be given except in special circumstances."

* in this case Resident.

Rule 57 of Book of Fin. Powers (G)

ii) The Auditor General's circular quoted at end of paragraph 1 of P.U.C.II makes the above clear. The position is that "the sanctioning authority should be asked to specify the special circumstances which necessitated sanction being accorded with retrospective effect Cases should be promptly brought to the notice of the Government of India direct when the cost involved by the revision is large and the reasons given for according sanction with retrospective effect are unsatisfactory"

(G)

(iii) This case does not appear by itself to "introduce a new principle or practice" such as is referred to in rule 2(b) of the Book of Financial Powers.

32

The question for consideration is

(i) Whether the Government of India may be addressed, the views of both the Audit Officer and the Pay and Accounts Officer being placed before them, or

(ii) Whether the views stated by the Pay and Accounts Officer may be communicated to

the

Audit Officer, it being left to the Audit Officer to make a report to the Government of India, if he thinks it necessary.

(i) may perhaps be preferable, as otherwise a report by the Audit Officer, in case he makes one, may probably have the appearance of a complaint.

33 P.U.C.III.

This relates to payment of special pay from 16th January 1928 and has nothing to do with retrospective effect. The Pay and Accounts Officer may perhaps be asked whether there is any technical objection to the adoption of the suggestion of the District Judge.

* Z * From his letter to the District Judge it would appear that the Pay and Accounts Officer sees no such objection but it may perhaps be well to make sure of the point, so as to avoid a subsequent objection ~~but it may perhaps be well to make sure of the point, so as to avoid a subsequent objection~~ in audit.

For orders.

(From paragraph 27)

Id. C.V.R
9-6-28

Id. W.O.S.
9/6/28.

34 The Resident might kindly first read P.U.C.'s I & II. The local Audit Officer is being unnecessarily troublesome and I should not be surprised if before long it proves necessary to make a representation regarding him to his departmental superiors. The view taken by the Pay and Accounts Officer in P.U.C.II seems unquestionably right The grant of retrospective sanction is not "the introduction of a new principle or practice" as contemplated

(G) in rule 2(b) of Part II of the Book of Financial Powers. It is obviously inconvenient to the Finance Department for long retrospective sanctions to be given, and the Finance Department therefore always oppose them unless strong special reasons are shown. This is all

Mr. Jukes' statement amounts to, that it is a standing rule of the Finance Department to give no retrospective effect. It is not a moral principle, but a mere rule of expediency; and the Finance Department is constantly being forced to give way in special cases to a greater or less degree by other Departments of the Government of India. This happened in several cases during the last 2 years when I was up in Simla The grant of - - retrospective sanction cannot therefore be said to be the introduction of a new principle or practice, but is a practice recognised by the Government of India, although only put in operation in exceptional cases. All the Resident has to do, vide P.U.C.II, is to specify the special circumstances which necessitated retrospective sanction being given, and this he has already done, vide S:N.59 If the Audit Officer is dissatisfied with the reasons given, he can if he likes report the case to the Government of India. I do not therefore think the Resident should ask for the approval of the Government of India under rule 2(b) of the Book of Financial Powers, as this would amount to a surrender of the discretion vested in him under the rules. Perhaps therefore a reply may be sent to the Audit Officer stating that the Resident is not prepared to take the course suggested by him for the reasons just given, and asking him should he still think it necessary to refer the matter to the Government of India to enclose a copy of this correspondence.

As regards paragraph 2 of P.U.C.I and P.U.C.III the course suggested by Office in paragraphs 29 & 33 may be taken.

From paragraph 27

Read

I quite agree: have at him!

11/6

13/6

Paragraphs 34–36

37

Two drafts are submitted for approval.

38

A The Audit Office is being asked to forward a copy of the correspondence & the Govt. of India should he still think it necessary to refer the matter to them, it is for consideration whether the substance of para 2 of Draft I may not remain in the Draft.

(From para. 34)

C.V.Ramanathayyar
20. 6. 28

20/6

Secretary

39

Please refair draft I as amended. Draft II may issue.

20/6

Refaired & submitted

C.V.Ramanathayyar
21. 6. 28

I draft for approval

22/6

Secretary

Records to note that the file should be put up early in November of each year (para. 3 of S.N. 4).

V.R.

Result

S.N. 4-5.

Secretary's notes 347-48 & 5. 7. 28

23/6

S.N.6 No. PBI-1081, dt 13.7.28
from the Dy. Accounts Offr

Up

P.V.C The Dy. Accounts Officer sees no objection to the adoption of the District Judge's suggestion in S.N. 3 ⊗

⊗ (V)

× (V)

≠ (M)

Draft submitted
(Para. 3 of draft is inserted in place of item S.N. 3 & S.N. 4)

C.V. Ramanathayyar
21.7.28

W.J. 21/7

Secretary

May issue
ACC
22/7

Readt.

JML
24/7

S.N-7 Issued vide 7073, dt 27.7.28

43

*D) In para. 3 of S.N.≠4 The Audit Officer was informed that The Resident accepted this suggestion that the necessity for the continuance of the special pay (Rs 75 p.m. for The Registrar of the D.C. & Sessions Court be reviewed annually; & that this would be done in November of each year

A report may perhaps be called for from The District & Sessions Judge

Draft submitted

(From para. 43)

C.V. Ramanathan
1.11.28

1/11

Secretary

1/XI

(H) S.N. 8 Issued vide No. 10266, dt 3.11.28

×S.N. 480
16 XII-28 (J)

S.N. 9 From: The Dist. & Sessions Judge,
Coms. M. 4349, dt. 6.11.28

49 In view of the report of the Dist. Judge in the p.c. in reply ← #S.N. 8, no action seems called for. The p.c.c. may be filed

#(H)

C.V. Ramanathan.
10.11.28

15/11/28

Tasildar

45 The headnt may kindly see our letter at S.N. 4 As circumstances remain unchanged the steward pay may be continued.

12/11

Asstt

46

acc 12/11

47 Perhaps The District Judge

5. The Audit Office may
informed of the orders
at paras. 45 & 46
Draft submitted

(From para. 45)

C. V. Ramanathan
15.11.28

15/11

S.N.10 Issued Nos. 10690-92, dt 19-11-28

S.N.11 Endorsement No. P.App.6114, dated the 13th December, 1928, from the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore.

---

45) Draft letter, with a re-appropriation statement is submitted for favour of approval.

(From para 48)

S. Singaroyan.
21-12-28

21/12/28

22/12

Secretary

(File recd. from Records section on 4.12.29)
4.12.29

(I)

(C)

J

(V

48

In para 3 of S.N.4 the Resident accepted the sugges ~~tion~~ of the Audit Officer that the necessity for the continuance of the special pay of Rs.75/- per mensem granted to the Registrar of the District and Sessions Court, C & M Station, in S.N.48 / 16 BII-25 , be reviewed annuall

50

The District Judge's report of last year will be found at S.N.9.

A report may perhaps be called for rrom this year also, as was done last year in S.N.8

Draft submitted.

C.V. Ramanathan
5. 12. 29

(Y) S.N. 17

Issued No. 11442, dated the 7th Dec.1929.

Records section
Please put up file on 19-12-29 for considering question of reminder

CVR
9.12.29

S.N.18. -- From the District and Sessions Judge, C & M Station, Bangalor No.6314, dated the 9th November 1929.

51

In view of the reply from the District and Sessions Judge, no change seems called for ~~and it is perhaps necessary to write to the Audit Officer in continuation of S.N.10~~. For orders.

The District Judge may perhaps be written to as in the draft copy being sent to the Audit Officer in continuation of S.N. 10

(From para. 49)

C.V. Ramanathan
13. 12. 29

S.N.19 ---------- Issued No. 342, d 11. 1. 30

C.F. 32.

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.

Audit DEPARTMENT. 60

Received *Registered*

From (Name) C.Reilly, Esq.,

(Designation) Audit Officer, Experiments,

Post Box, (Station) Bangalore.

Telegraphic Address

ACCOUNTS OFFICE. Bangalore. Number 4690 of Receipt 28/5/28 No. 16.B.II/25

Enclosures (1)

Spare Copies

S.N. 59 (S)

To The Secretary to the Hon'ble
the Resident in Mysore, Bangalore.

No. Bang Audit dated 25.5.1928
4-11-200.

Sir,

Special pay of Rs.75/- per mensem to the Registrar of the District Court.

I have the honour to invite a reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.4661/16-B-II-1925, dated 10-5-28, setting forth the circumstances -- under which a special pay of Rs.75 per mensem has been granted to the Registrar of the District Court from 1-11-26. As an Audit Officer, I would remind you that it is a standing rule of the Government of India, -- Finance Department, that no retrospective effect should be given to charges of this nature. (Please see copy of letter No.825, dated 12-1-25 from the Officer on Special duty Finance Department to the Pay & Accounts Officer enclosed herewith). In the circumstances, may I therefore suggest that the approval of the Government of India be obtained under Rule 2 (b) of the Book of Financial Powers for the new departure from this standing rule which this particular case introduces.

S.N. 48 (J)

2. The sanction in Proceedings No. 390, dated 16-1-28 is indefinite in regard to the period in which it should remain in operation. It is, therefore, also suggested that the necessity for the continuance of the special pay be reviewed from time to time - say - once a year — with a view to seeing whether the necessity continues for paying any special pay or at the same rate.

3. The orders issued by the Hon'ble the Resident may be communicated to me at an early date

22.5.20

Audit Officer.

18.5.20

J.E.C. Jukes Esq, C.I.E, I.C.S

Letter No 825 dt 12-1-25 from the Officer on Special Duty Govt. of India Finance Dept: to the Pay & Accts Office Bangalore —

With reference to your letter no P & A. Misc /1349. dt 3-1-25, I have the honour to sanction the grant of special pay at Rs 20/- per mensem to Mr. Ayyasami Iyer, Head Accountant of your office, for a period of one year from the 1st ~~February~~ February next. I may mention that it is a standing rule of the finance department that no retrospective effect should be given to charges of this nature. It must be clearly understood that the grant of the special pay is strictly a temporary measure.

'True Copy'

A.S. Ramachandra
Asst. Supdt.

Telegraphic Address: Bangacts, BANGALORE.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
The Pay and Accounts Office
BANGALORE.

Telephone: Office 47

Ref. No. P.B. 797 — 1st June 1928

Enclosures

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to xxxx letter No. Bang. Audit. 4-11-200, dated 25-5-1928, from the Audit Officer, Bangalore, to your address, (copy of which has been communicated by him for my information) regarding the grant of a special pay of Rs. 75/- per mensem to the Registrar, District Court, I have the honour to invite a reference to para 25 of the interim report of the Public Accounts Committee on the accounts of 1921-22 and to the orders thereon in para 12 of the Government of India, Finance Department, Resolution, No. 37A, dated 15-1-24, from which it appears that sanctions to revisions of pay with retrospective effect are not absolutely forbidden and that they may be given in special circumstances. I do not therefore think that Rule 2(b)(of Part II) of the Book of Financial Powers quoted by the Audit Officer applies to the case, as the principle or practice of retrospective sanctions to increased emoluments is not a new one but is one already recognized and governed by the orders quoted I may also give below the decision of the Auditor-General in the matter:-

" ..... in cases where retrospective effect is given to a revision of pay of establishments of individuals, the sanctioning authority should be asked to specify the special circumstances, which necessitated sanction being accorded with restrospective effect. Cases should be promptly brought to the notice of the

Government

Government of India direct when the cost involved by the revision is large and the reasons given for according sanction with retrospective effect are unsatisfactory." (Auditor-General's letter No.1208-Admn/292-24, dated July 1924).

not avn. in R.O.

2) I understand the remark of the Officer on Special Duty Government of India, Finance Department in his letter No.825, dated 12-1-25 to this office, to which particular reference has been made by the Audit Officer, to mean that retrospective sanctions are against the standing rule and not that they can in no circumstances be ~~given~~ an exception.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Pay and Account Officer
BANGALORE.

SHN.

No. 1763 Enclos. 2 CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION,

Bangalore, 7th June 192 8

FROM

RESIDENT'S OFFICE
BANGALORE
Diary No. 5008
Date of Receipt 8/6/28
Sig. No.

B. RAMA RAU ESQ., B.A., B. L.,

District and Sessions Judge,

C. & M. Station, Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble

the Resident in Mysore,

BANGALORE.

SIR,

SUBJECT :- SPECIAL PAY TO THE REGISTRAR OF THE DISTRICT COURT CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION, BANGALORE.

-:o:-

S.N. 48(J)
S.N. 57(L)

I have the honour to invite a reference to the Proceedings of the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, Nos. 390 and 2904 dated 16-1-1928 and 21-3-1928 respectively sanctioning the grant of a Special Pay of Rs 75/- per mensem to the Registrar of my Court with retrospective effect from 1-11-1926, and to state that a bill for - - Rs 1275/- being the Special Pay of the Registrar from 1-11-1926 to - 31-3-1928 was presented to the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore, on 2-4-1928 and disallowed by him on the ground that sanction to any given expenditure becomes operative only on funds being appropriated for that purpose. On the same ground the Special Pay of the Registrar for the months of April and May 1928 also was disallowed by the Pay and Accounts Officer from the monthly pay-bills of this Office. As the question of giving effect to the sanction in so far as it relates to retrospective Special Pay only is still under the consideration of the Hon'ble the Resident, I wrote to the Pay and Accounts Officer requesting him to allow my Registrar to draw his current Special Pay at least from the date of the original sanction, viz., 16-1-1928, and await the final

S. 20.—R. P. B.—6-1922.—2,500.

P. T. O.

final orders of the Hon'ble the Resident on the subject of " retrospective Special Pay " . A copy of my letter to the Pay and Accounts Officer, No. 1670, dated 5-6-1928 is enclosed herewith for your information. The Pay and Accounts Officer in his reply No. P.B.560, dated the 6th instant, (Copy of letter enclosed) has asked me to obtain the sanction of the Hon'ble the Resident to meet the extra expenditure caused by the payment of the current Special Pay to the Registrar from 16-1-1928 out of the existing appropriation under " F. 3 (2) Pay of Establishment " and for suggesting reappropriation of funds, if necessary, later on in the year. The extra expenditure during the year proposed now amounts to Rs 1014/- being the Special Pay from 16-1-1928 to 31-3-1929.

Rs 19,700 (Budget not put up)

In the circumstances explained above, I have the honour to request that the Hon'ble the Resident may be pleased to sanction the meeting of the extra expenditure of Rs 1014/- out of the existing appropriation under " F. 3 (2) Pay of Establishment " and to permit me to approach him for reappropriation of additional funds, if necessary, later on in the year.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

B. Ramarao

PSR.

DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE.

Copy of letter No.1670 dated 5/6/1928 from the District & Sessions Judge, C & M Station, Bangalore, to the Pay & Accounts Officer, Bangalore.

****

Subject.- Special Pay for the Registrar of this Court.- Reference.-Your Memorandum No. P.B./1/19 dated 4/4/1928, B.H.M.3 dated 1/2 May 1928 and B.H.M.1 dated 1/6/1928.

I have the honour to inform you that the question of giving effect to the sanction of the grant of special pay of Rs 75/- per mensem in so far as it relates to retrospective pay from 1/11/1926 up to 15/1/1928 is under the consideration of the Hon'ble the Resident and that final orders on the subject will be communicated to you as soon as they are passed by the Hon'ble the Resident. But I think you will agree with me that the Registrar may be allowed to draw his current Special Pay with effect from the date of the sanction, viz., 16/1/1928 (please see proceedings of the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, No.390 dated 16/1/1928), as ordinarily a sanction takes immediate effect from the date of the order. As regards appropriation of funds to meet this extra expenditure, it is too early for me to state what savings I anticipate in the current year's budget under the head F3(2) - Pay of Establishment, and what additional funds are required to meet this extra expenditure. I will be in a position to give more definite information on this point by about November or December. If at that time I find that the existing funds under the head of "Pay of Establishment" are not sufficient to cover this additional expenditure also, I shall then address the Residency through you for an allotment of additional funds and shall be also in a position to suggest any reappropriations of amounts from one sub-head to the other of this Court's budget itself if probable savings are anticipated under any of the sub-heads. Meanwhile I would request you to arrange for the payment of the current special pay of the Registrar from 16/1/1928 onwards from ~~out of the available funds under~~

from out of the available funds under the head of "Pay of Establishment" of this Court's budget allotment. As it is over four months since the Hon'ble the Resident was pleased to accord his sanction to the grant of a special pay to the Registrar of my Court, my Registrar is put to much inconvenience by not being allowed to draw even his current pay. I would therefore request you to allow him to draw his current special pay with effect from 16/1/1928 without any further delay. If you agree to comply with my request, I shall cuase a separate pay bill to be prepared for his special pay from 16/1/1928 to the end of May 1928 and sent to your office for payment.

An early reply is solicited.

****

"T r u e C o p y"

B. Rama Rao

District & Sessions Judge.

Copy of letter No. P.B.560 dated 6th June 1928, from the Pay & Account Officer, Bangalore, to the District & Sessions Judge, C & M Station, Bangalore.

****

With reference to your letter No.1670, dated 5/6/1928 re: the special pay for the Registrar of the District Court, I have the honour to invite a reference to para 2 of the Hon'ble the Resident's Proceedings No.390, dated 16/1/1928, which states that "effect will be given to this order when funds become available by re-appropriation or otherwise".

(J)

In the circumstances explained by you regarding the difficulty of suggesting re-appropriation of funds early in the year, the sanction of the Hon'ble the Resident may kindly be obtained for meeting the extra expenditure out of the existing appropriation under F3(2) Pay of Establishment and for suggesting re-appropriation of funds, if necessary, later on in the year.

On receipt of such sanction, the special pay for the period from 16/1/1928 may be drawn.

****

"T r u e C o p y"

B Ramarao

District & Sessions Judge.

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary to the Resident in Mysore, Bangalore, by designation and not by name.

No. 6347 Enc.
202-1928.

4

From

A. C. Lothian, Esquire, I.C.S.,

SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE.

To

The Audit Officer,
Experiments, Bangalore.

Dated Bangalore, 5 July *1928*

Subject.

Special pay for the Registrar, District Court, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore Retrospective effect.

Sir,

S.N.1. I am directed to refer to your letter No.4-11-200, dated the 25th May, 1928 and to state that, in the opinion of the Hon'ble the Resident, the grant of retrospective sanction in the case in question does not require the approval of the Government of India under * rule 2(b) in Part II of the Book of Financial Powers, as suggested by you. The Resident is aware that the Finance Department of the Government of India ordinarily refuse to sanction increases of pay with retrospective effect: but exceptions to this rule of practice have repeatedly been made by the Government of India in special circumstances, and in view of such precedents the Resident is unable to agree that the grant of retrospective sanction in the circumstances of the present case amounts to the introduction of a new principle or practice and so requires the sanction of the Government of India. It is, moreover, apparent from paragraph 12 of the Resolution of the Government of India (Finance Department) No.37-A, dated the 15th January, 1924, that, while directing that authorities competent to sanction revisions of pay should bear in mind that retrospective effect should not be given except

* Flag G.

vide S.N.59 53

except in special circumstances, the Government of India have clearly left it to these authorities themselves to decide whether the special circumstances of a particular case justify the grant of retrospective sanction. For these reasons, the Hon'ble the Resident is not prepared to take the course suggested in paragraph 1 of your letter under reply. Should you however still think it necessary to refer the matter to the Government of India, I am to request that a copy of this correspondence may be forwarded to them.

2. In this regard it may be mentioned that the Pay and Accounts Officer was, and still is, of opinion that the sanction of the Government of India is not called for by the rules on the subject.

3. I am to add that the Resident accepts your suggestion that the necessity for the continuance of the special pay be reviewed annually. This will be done in November of each year.

para. 2 of 5-IV-1

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

o/c

SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT.

4/1/28.

BJ

[R. O. 106 (a)].

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary to the Resident in Mysore, Bangalore, by designation and not by name.

OFFICE OF THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 5th July 1928

No. 6348 ENCLOS.

A copy of the marginally* noted letter, ~~with enclosure~~, is forwarded to the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore, with the request that he will be so good as to state whether there is any technical objection to the adoption of the suggestion made therein.

Pvt III
SN. B

*No. 1763 dated the 7th June 1928, from the District Judge Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

Sd/ A. C. Lothian

Secretary to the Resident.

C.V. Ramanuja Rao 20.6.28.

532—15-9-1927—5,000—RPB.

1.6.41

Telegraphic Address: Bangacfs, BANGALORE.	GOVERNMENT OF INDIA The Pay and Accounts Office BANGALORE.	Telephone : Office 47

Ref. No. P.B.1-1081. 13th July 1928

Enclosures

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble
the Resident in Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

x S.N. 5 V). S.N. 3-

With reference to your Endt. No.6348/202-1928, dated 5th July 1928 forwarding copy of letter No.1763, dated 7-6-1928 from the District Judge, Bangalore regarding payment of the special pay of the Registrar from 16-1-28, I have the honour to state that there is no objection to the adoption of the suggestion made in the letter of the District Judge.

Necessary reappropriation of funds should be made later on in the year in case the appropriation under "F3(2) Pay of Establishment" is likely to be ~~executed~~ exceeded.

[illegible] 6085 14/7/28 [illegible]

SHN.

I have the honour to be
Your most obedient Servant
S Narasimhan
Pay and Account Officer
BANGALORE.

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary to the Resident in Mysore, Bangalore, by designation and not by name.

No. 7073
202-1928

DATED BANGALORE, 27 July, 1928.

FROM

A. C. Lothian, Esquire, I.C.S.

SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE,

To

The District and Sessions Judge,
Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

S.N. 3

Reference ~~his~~ ~~your~~ ~~letter~~ ~~memo.~~ No. 1763, dated the 7th June, 1928.

Subject.

Applying for sanction for the payment of special pay to the Registrar, District Court, from 16th January, 1928, out of the existing appropriation under "F.3(2) Pay of Establishment"

S a n c t i o n e d.

2. The District and Sessions Judge is requested to suggest a re-appropriation of funds later in the year, if the appropriation under "F.3(2) - Pay of Establishment" is likely to be exceeded.

3. He is also requested to submit proposals to meet the amount of the special pay from 1st November 1926 to 15th January, 1928.

Sd. A. C. Lothian,

SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT.

No. 2074-75 d 27-7-28

Copy forwarded to the Pay & Accounts Officer, the Audit Officer, Pay and Accounts Office, Bangalore, with reference to his letter No.PB1-1081, dated the 13th July, 1928.

O/C

SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT.

B

Memorandum

No. 10266

From Secy. to The Resdt.

Bangalore, dated 3rd Nov 1928.

To The District & Sessions Judge
Cant Station
Bangalore.

Subject Special pay for The Registra District & Sessions Court, Cant Station, Bangalore.

para. 3 of S.N. 4 ante

(D)

I am directed to inform the Hon'ble the Resident accepted the suggestion ~~made~~ by of The Audit Officer Experiments, Bangalore That the necessity for the continuance of the special pay of Rs 75/- per mensem granted to The Registrar of your Court in Resident's Proceedings no. 390, dated the 16th January 1928, be reviewed annually.

S.N. 48 (A)
16 B II-25 (T)

Wi

Will you please
therefore submit
a report in the
matter

Sd. W. O. Sherwood.
Captain.
for Secy. to the Resident

C. V. Ramanathan
1. 11. 28

No. 4349 Enclos.

CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION,

Bangalore, 6 - 11 - 1928.

FROM

C. V. Reddi Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

District and Sessions Judge,

C. & M. Station, Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble

the Resident in Mysore,

Bangalore.

SIR,

SUBJECT:- SPECIAL PAY FOR THE REGISTRAR, DISTRICT COURT, C.& M. STATION, BANGALORE.

-:oOo:-

S.N.8 With reference to your Memorandum No. 10266, dated 3-11-1928, I have the honour to report that circumstances have not changed since the issue of the Proceedings of the Hon'ble the Resident, No. 390, dated 16-1-1928 and to state that the grounds which necessitat the grant of Special Pay to the Registrar then continue to exist even now also.

I have the honour to be,

Sir.

Your most obedient Servant,

District and Sessions Judge.

PSR.

S. 20.—R. P. B.—6-1922.—2,500.

(1)

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary to the Resident in Mysore, Bangalore, by designation and not by name.

No. 10690 DATED BANGALORE, 19 - 11 - 28.

FROM

SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE,

To The District & Sessions Judge
Cow station,
Bangalore

S. N. 5 (W)

Reference ~~this~~ your ~~letter memo.~~ No. 4349 dated the 6th Nov. 1928

Subject.

Special pay of Rs 75 p.m. for the Registrar, District & Sessions Court.

In the circumstances reported the Hon'ble The Resident agrees to the continuance of the special pay sanctioned in his Proceedings no 390, dated the 16th January 1928

S. N. 48 / 16 B II - 25 (J)

for Secy. to the Resdt

PTO

No. 10691 Encl
10692

Copy forwarded to The Dy. Accounts Officer, Bangalore

The Audit Officer,
Experiments, Bangalore,
in continuation of
para. 3 of Residency
letter† no. 6347/202-1928
dated the 5th July,
1928.

† S.IV.4 (D)

p.w.c. (with copy of letter from the Dt. Judge no. 4349, dt. 6.11.28)

C. V. Ramanatham
15.11.28

for Secy. to the Resdt

Telegraphic Address: Bangacts, BANGALORE.	GOVERNMENT OF INDIA **The Pay and Accounts Office** **BANGALORE.**	Telephone: Office 47

Ref. No.P.App. ~~6114~~ 6114. (MEMORANDUM) 13th December 1928.

Enclosures Letter

RESIDENT'S OFFICE
BANGALORE.
Register No. 11856
Date of Receipt 15/12/28
File No. 209/28

To

The Secretary to the Resident,
BANGALORE.

~~Sir~~

Reference:- Letter No.4640 dated the 22nd November 1928 from the District and Sessions Judge, Bangalore, regarding provision of Rs.1087 in the current year's Budget Estimate on account of payment of arrears of special pay to the Registrar.

F o r w a r d e d.

The sum of Rs.1087/- required for payment of arrears of special pay to the Registrar, may be reappropriated to "Account IV F.3(2) Pay of Establishment from the savings available under "Acct.IV - K. Superannuation Allowances and pensions." A saving of Rs.2140 is anticipated under the latter head, of which a sum of Rs.1000/- has been proposed for surrender to Government of India Vide this office endorsement No. ~~P.Appropriation 6055~~ O/app-.6053 dated the 11th December 1928. A sum of Rs.1140 is thus available for reappropriation.

The provision of Rs.1088/- included in the Budget Estimate for 1929-30 under "Acct.IV.F3 (2) Pay of Establishment" for arrears of special pay has been omitted by this office in the change statements sent to Government of India.

VDV.

PAY AND ACCOUNTS OFFICER.
Ac wb.

No. 4640 Enclos.

Civil and Military Station,

Bangalore, 22nd November *1928*.

THE PAY AND ACCOUNT OFFICE
Date 26 NOV. 1928
Current File No. 6525

From

C. V. Reddi Esq., B.A., B.L.,
District and Sessions Judge,
C. & M. Station, Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Through:

The Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 4552, dated the 20th instant, I have the honour to state that a sum of Rs 1087/- being the arrears of Special Pay to the Registrar of my Court from 1-11-1926 to 15-1-1928 referred to in paragraph 3 of the Hon'ble the Resident's Proceedings No. 7073/202-1928, dated 27-7-1928 has been provided for by me in the Budget Estimate of this office for the year 1929-30 sent to you already as I was not sure then of funds being available to meet this expenditure during the current year by reappropriation or otherwise and has hence not been included in Cols. 6, 7, and 8 under "F. 3(2) Pay of Establishments" in the statement sent with my last letter. If funds can possibly be found to meet this item of expenditure during the current year itself, I have the honour to request that an additional sum of Rs 1087/- over and above Rs 1200/- asked for by me in column 8 of the statement may also be kindly provided for by reappropriation.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

C. V. Reddi
District and Sessions Judge.

PSR.

S. 20.—R. P. B.—6-1922.—2,500.

Bangalore Budget estimates for 1928-29 13

Expenditure proposed to be provided for :—

R 1087/-

of (a) payment of arrears of special pay of the Registrar, District & Sessions Court.

on account { *Major-head.* / *Minor-head.* / *Sub-head.* / *Detailed head.* }

Account IV - Other expenditure heads
F. Administration of Justi
F. 3 Civil & Sessions Court
F. 3(2) Pay of establishmen

Amount proposed to be spent during current year — *Rs.* 21,607

Amount proposed to be spent during future years — *Rs.*

1	2	3	4
Heads of estimate affected by the proposal (*b*)	Actual expenditure up to date of the proposal (*viz.*,)	Amounts as in the estimate passed by Government.	Amounts as they will stand after re-appropriation.
(1) Heads under which the proposed expenditure will fall.			
Account IV - Other expenditure heads			
F. Administration of Justice		19,700+820 re-appropriated in R.G. No. 11326 dt. 8-12-28 = 20,520	21,607+1087
F. 3 Civil & Sessions Court			
F. 3(2) Pay of establishments			
Total.....		20,520	21,607+1087
(2) Heads under which it is proposed to reduce the grants.			
Account IV - Other expenditure heads			
K. Superannuation allowances and pensions		41,000	39,913-1087
Total.....		41,000	39,913-1087

(*a*) Here enter full description, mentioning the Department, or Office, or Officer concerned.

(*b*) The same detail must be shown as in the printed estimates of the Government (or the sanctioned estimate), as the re-appropriation has to be affected by transfer of the figures shown therein

NOTE.—Any further explanations should be given on reverse, where also, if no re-appropriation is possible, the urgency and necessity for the expenditure should be fully explained.

NOTE.—When the application is submitted for the sanction of a Local Government, the form may be modified in any way the Local Government thinks fit, provided that the Local Government indicates distinctly in the orders issued that the new expenditure is to be met by re-appropriation from anticipated savings under the same or another major-head.

Sanctioned under Rule 67 of the Book of Financial Powers.

144 Encls
₹ 8516 186

Resident's Office,
Bangalore, 7-11 - 1928

Secretary to the Resident.

S. 13.—R. P. B.—1-1-1921.—3,000.

The District & Sessions Judge, C.&M. Station, Bangalore.
The Pay & Accounts Officer, Bangalore.
The Audit Officer, Ex-Governments, Bangalore.

S. Sivagarayan

DEPARTMENT. File No.

BRANCH. Serial No.

Draft Letter / Memorandum / Telegram

Class for telegrams — Ordinary / Express / Urgent* / Priority / Clear Line† — *Only for Foreign Telegrams. †Not for Foreign Telegrams.

To be issued on | Issued on

1st Reminder

2nd Reminder

3rd Reminder

Heading :

Case or Diary No.

If post copy of telegram required

Date of despatch of above

List of enclosures

(Code word for telegrams.)

enclosure to S.N. 11
P.2.C

No. 1446-Genl Dated 5-1 1929

To

The District and Sessions Judge,
Civil and Military Station,
Bangalore.

Payment of arrears of special pay to the Registrar, District and Sessions Court.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 4640, dated the 22nd November, 1928, I am directed to state that a sum of Rs. 1,087/- has been re-appropriated to the head "Account IV-Other expenditure heads-F-Administration of Justice-F.3(2)-Pay of Establishment to meet the payment of arrears of special pay to the Registrar of your court from the 1st November, 1926, to the 15th January, 1928.

2. A re-appropriation statement is enclosed. I have etc.,

Sd/- A. C. Lothian
Secretary to the Resident.
P.T.O.

S. 5.

MGIPC—FP—437DCF—S&P—(G-1478)—29-1-27—15,000 Pads.

No. 145

A copy of the foregoing letter is forwarded to the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore, for information with reference to his endorsement No P.App. 6114, dated the 13th December, 1928.

S.N. 11
P.R.C

Sd/- A.C. Lothian
Secretary to the Resident.

S. Singaravelan
21-12-28

DEPARTMENT. File No.

BRANCH. Serial No.

Draft Letter / Memorandum / Telegram

Class for telegrams — Ordinary / Express / Urgent* / Priority / Clear Line† — *Only for Foreign Telegrams. †Not for Foreign Telegrams.

To be issued on | Issued on

1st Reminder

2nd Reminder

3rd Reminder

Heading:

Case or Diary No.

If post copy of telegram required

Date of despatch of above

List of enclosures

(Code word for telegrams.)

S.N.4
202-28.
(F)

No. 4077 Dated 4-8-1928

From

The Secretary to the Resident.

To

The Audit Officer,

Experiments, Bangalore.

SPECIAL PAY FOR THE REGISTRAR, DISTRICT COURT, CIVIL & MILITARY STATION, BANGALORE - RETROSPECTIVE EFFECT.

Sir,

I am directed to this Residency letter No.6347, dated the 5th July, 1928, and to enquire whether it can be presumed that the objection in the case of the grant of special pay for the Registrar, District Court, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore, with retrospective effect, has now been withdrawn.

I have, etc.,

for SECRETARY TO THE RESIDENT

W Basappa
2/8/28.

S. 5.
MG1PC—S1—1331(G1)DCF—(G-502)—17-8-28—40,000 Pads.

No.Bang Audits.
4-17-104
28-29

Office of the Audit Officer,
"Experiments",
Mayo Hall, Bangalore,
Dated 7th May 1929.

From

P.C.Chetti, Esq., B.A.,

Audit Officer,

Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Resident

in Mysore, Bangalore.

Special pay to the Registrar- District Court-
Retrospective effect.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No.4077/348-1928 dated 4th May 1929 enquiring whether it can be presumed that the objection in the case of the grant of special pay for the Registrar, District Court, Bangalore, with retrospective effect has been withdrawn, I have the honour to inform you that it has been decided to accept the sanction of the Hon'ble the Resident in the circumstances explained.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Audit Officer.

K.R.

Memorandum.

No. 11442

From

Secretary to the Resident.

Bangalore, dated 7.12.29

To The District and Sessions Judge

C & M Station,

B a n g a l o r e.

S.N. 8
10.

Reference:- Memoranda from this office No.10266, dated the 3rd November 1928 and No.10690, dated the 19th November, 1928, regarding special pay of Rs.75 per mensem for the Registrar, District and Session Court, C & M Station, Bangalore.

The District and Sessions Judge is requested to submit a report in regard to the necessity for the continuance of the special pay of Rs.75/- per mensem granted to the Registrar of the District and Sessions Court in the Hon'ble the Resident's Proceedings No.390, dated the 16th January 1928.

S.N. 48
16 B II - 25

5/12

for Secretary to the Resident.

R.O.
5.12.29

Id. Orde 5.12.29.

1283—22-3-1929—4,000—RPB.

No. 6314 Enclos.

District and Sessions Court,
Civil and Military Station,
Bangalore, dated 9/(11)/12 *19* 29.

From

C. V. Reddi Esq., B. A., B. L.,
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION,
BANGALORE.

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble
the Resident in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

SUBJECT:- SPECIAL PAY FOR THE REGISTRAR, DISTRICT COURT, C. & M. STATION, BANGALORE.

*****

With reference to your Memorandum No. 11442, dated the 7th December 1929, I have the honour to report that circumstances have not changed since the issue of the Proceedings of the Hon'ble the Resident No. 390 dated 16-1-1928 and to state that the ground which necessitated the grant of Special Pay to the Registrar then, continue to exist even now also.

I have the honor to be,
Sir.
Your most obedient servant,

District & Sessions Judge.

PSR.